```
Case 3:11-cv-00527-LRH-WGC Document 12 Filed 01/05/12 Page 1 of 2
 1
2
3
4
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
                             DISTRICT OF NEVADA
5
                                RENO, NEVADA
6
7
   SARA AND COLIN BATTERHAM,
                                            3:11-cv-00527-ECR-WGC
8
        Plaintiffs,
                                            Order
9
   vs.
10
   SURAT SINGH, KHALSA RESORTS,
11
        Defendants.
12
13
14
        Plaintiffs filed a Complaint (#1) on July 22, 2011 alleging
15 four causes of action arising under state law: (1) Denial of CA
16 State Wage Laws; (2) Defamation; (3) False Light; and (4) Infliction
17 of Emotional Distress.
18
        Now pending is Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Lack of
19 \parallel \text{Jurisdiction} (#5) filed on October 20, 2011. On October 21, 2011,
20 the Court issued a Minute Order (#8) advising Plaintiffs, appearing
21 pro se, that if they failed to respond their case could be
22 dismissed. Plaintiffs did not respond.
23
        Diversity jurisdiction is proper where the parties are citizens
24 of different states. 28 U.S.C. § 1332. For this reason, the
25 citizenship of the parties is a jurisdictional fact in diversity
26 actions, and the burden is on the party attempting to invoke
27 diversity jurisdiction to affirmatively plead facts that provide a
28 basis for exercising jurisdiction. Bautista v. Pan Am. World
```

Case 3:11-cv-00527-LRH-WGC Document 12 Filed 01/05/12 Page 2 of 2

1 Airlines, Inc., 828 F.2d 546, 552 (9th Cir. 1987). In this case, Plaintiffs have failed to plead jurisdictional facts, including the 3 citizenship of the parties. Moreover, Defendants have sufficiently 4 proved that they are citizens of California, while the Plaintiffs' 5 address listed on their complaint is also in California. Finally, Plaintiffs have failed to respond to Defendants' 6 7 Motion to Dismiss (#5) in spite of an Order of the Court (#8) $8 \parallel \text{directing them to do so.}$ Local Rule 7-2(d) provides that "[t]he 9 failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in $10 \parallel response$ to any motion shall constitute a consent to the granting of 11 the motion." 12 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs' complaint (#1) must be 13 dismissed. 14 15 IT IS, THEREFORE, HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' Motion to 16 Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction (#5) is **GRANTED**. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiffs shall have twenty-one 17 (21) days within which to file an amended complaint showing proper 19 jurisdiction in this court. Should Plaintiffs fail to do so, the 20 case will be dismissed. 21 22 DATED: January 5, 2012.

2526

27

24

28